

REMARKS

Claims 1-31, as amended, remain herein.

1. Claims 1-9, 11-20, 22, 23 and 25-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Balakrishnan et al. U.S. Patent 7,035,240 (“Balakrishnan”).

Balakrishnan discloses a method for creating an energy efficient wireless network. Balakrishnan forms a network from a plurality of nodes and a base station. At least one node is singled out to operate as a cluster-head. A plurality of clusters are formed from the plurality of nodes, where each of the clusters have at least one cluster-head. Data is transmitted from at least one node in at least one of the plurality of clusters to the cluster-head in that cluster. The cluster-head then transmits the data to the base station. The process of selecting a cluster-head is based on a probabilistic function of an amount of energy remaining in each of the plurality of nodes.

Balakrishnan discloses that each cluster-head may combine or aggregate data; see Balakrishnan col. 15 lines 29-33. The combination or aggregation of data, which is merely the collection of data without changing the form of the data, is different from the transformation of data from one format to another, as claimed by applicants. Thus, Balakrishnan does not disclose the transformation of data from one format to another, as claimed by applicants.

Balakrishnan therefore does not disclose all elements of applicants’ claimed invention, and therefore is not a proper basis for a §102(e) rejection. Nor is there any disclosure or teaching in Balakrishnan that would have suggested applicants’ claimed invention to one of ordinary skill

in this art. Thus reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection, and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested.

2. Claims 10 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Balakrishnan.

Claims 10 and 24, which depend from claims 1 and 18, are allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 18, in that Balakrishnan does not teach or suggest transformation of data.

3. Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Balakrishnan and Mulgund et al. U.S. Patent 6,816,862 (“Mulgund”).

Mulgund does not disclose what is missing in Balakrishnan. Mulgund discloses a relational database having an aggregate model of the state of an ad hoc network comprised of uniquely addressable distributed sensor nodes, but not the transformation of data from one format to another, as claimed by applicants.

Thus, for all of the foregoing reasons, there is no disclosure or teaching in either Balakrishnan or Mulgund that would have suggested applicants’ claimed invention to one of ordinary skill in this art. Further, there is no disclosure or teaching in either Balakrishnan or Mulgund that would have suggested the desirability of modifying or combining any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants’ claimed invention. Withdrawal of this rejection, and allowance of all claims are therefore respectfully requested.

4. Claim 31 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Balakrishnan and Close U.S.

Serial No.: 10/699,356

Page 13 of 14

Patent 3,064,250 ("Close").

Close does not disclose what is missing in Balakrishnan. Close discloses a track-while-scan channel for use with search radar, but not the transformation of data from one format to another, as claimed by applicants.

Thus, for all of the foregoing reasons, there is no disclosure or teaching in either Balakrishnan or Close that would have suggested applicants' claimed invention to one of ordinary skill in this art. Further, there is no disclosure or teaching in either Balakrishnan or Close that would have suggested the desirability of modifying or combining any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants' claimed invention. Withdrawal of this rejection, and allowance of all claims are therefore respectfully requested.

Accordingly, the application is now fully in condition for immediate allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested. The PTO is hereby authorized to charge/credit any fee deficiencies or overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-4293 (Order No. 12492.0148). If further amendments would place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is invited to call applicants' undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

Serial No.: 10/699,356
Page 14 of 14

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 14, 2006



Scott D. Watkins, Reg. No. 36,175
Tyson Y. Winarski, Reg. No. 41,381

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP
1330 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036-1795
Tel: (202) 429-6420
Fax: (202) 828-3658

RWP/TYW:mn1